DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 899 JC 970 483

AUTHOR	Hatton, Michael J.
TITLE	A Pure Theory of Lifelong Learning.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	15p.; In: Lifelong Learning: Policies, Practices, and Programs; see JC 970 458.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; *Competition; Distance Education; Educational Change; Educational Resources; Information Technology; *Lifelong Learning; Local Government; Postsecondary Education; *Private Sector
IDENTIFIERS	*Tiebout (Charles)

ABSTRACT

Charles Tiebout's Pure Theory of Local Expenditures serves as a helpful framework in examining the emergence of the learning society, communications technologies, freer trade, and the effects these will have on the educational infrastructure. Tiebout argued that the failure of market-type systems of public good at the central government level does not necessarily mean failure at the local level. The advent of technology and an information society provides citizens with more freedom to relocate should they be unhappy with their local governments and politicians, creating competition between governments and a desire to best serve its citizens. Local governments, which are directly responsible for delivering education, must therefore provide adequate post-secondary education to increase the attractiveness of their community. In order to remain competitive, many colleges and universities have designed courses and programs for electronic delivery, via the Internet and World Wide Web. Smaller local educational institutions, however, might not benefit from such developments when in competition with larger, well known institutions, and will likely find it difficult to obtain public support. As a result, the private sector delivery of education will increase dramatically, pushing government and publicly sponsored institutions aside. This may increase the exclusivity of higher education, and, unfortunately, further hinder the path of lifelong learning. Contains 12 references. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* . from the original document. *
****

MKH

ED 411 899

A Pure Theory of Lifelong Learning

Michael J. Hatton

In: Lifelong Learning: Policies, Practices, and Programs

JC 970 483

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. J. Hatton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Pure Theory of Lifelong Learning[1]

by Michael J. Hatton

Lifelong learning presupposes the development of a learning society, one where active, ongoing learning of a higher order will be broadly embraced. As this learning ethic develops, the demand for increased educational opportunities of all types will be unprecedented. Tiebout's "Pure Theory of Local Expenditures", a seminal paper in finance, has direct application for understanding consumer interests and pressures, the role of the central versus local governments, and the effects of consumer mobility and knowledge. Using his theory as a frameuvork, this paper discusses the emergence of the learning society, coupled with communications technologies and freer trade, and the effects these will have on the formation and delivery of education and educational infrastructure including the blend of public and private sector participation.

TOWARDS A LEARNING SOCIETY

Regardless of whether there is reasonable rational importance for more to be said about lifelong learning, it must be concluded that much more, indeed very much more, will continue to be said. The term has become thematic and evocative; it is raised, praised, discussed, even worshiped, and occasionally, but not for long, discarded, almost every day in the popular press, government documents and academic journals. It has taken on the characteristics of a nondenominational paean, and the proper responses to it are important shibboleths of interest groups and political orientations. It is recognized by most people as a concept of political importance and a factor influencing the political saleability of government roles and levels of expenditures. There is now and will in the future be no avoiding the taking of positions for and against concrete propositions pertaining to lifelong learning and public expenditures.

As with other *truths*, the adoption of lifelong learning into our lives and vocabularies comes with some perils, not the least of which is definitional. What does lifelong learning mean? To whom? When? Clearly, as with many other educational or

[1]Pure thought, pure reasoning and pure theory are closely related notions. Aristotle, or the intellectual tradition that bears his name, argued the claim that we can formulate laws of nature by pure thought and that it is not necessary to resort to observation. Immanuel Kant meant by pure reason not much more than we do by "science". Pure theory (of lifelong learning) here means only that the reality of its subject is assumed and can be discretely appreciated, even though it cannot be, nor ever has been, isolated from the contexts in which it has been claimed to exist.

near-educational terms, semantics has not to date been a principal consideration. (After all, as some might say, "this is education, not chemistry.") But surely this should not restrict us from the practice of clearly defining what we mean; rather, it should foster the practice.

In order to better appreciate the difficulties associated with vocabulary in the field of education, let's start with *education* itself. Often, education is used to refer to any experience. Within the experiential framework, education is anything and everything either directly or indirectly enjoyed through the process of living. Seeing the sun, walking in the rain, winning a lottery, making a friend, or listening to a teacher is, within this meaning, education of one sort or another. Or, at the very least, living carries the potential for education. At another time or in another paper, education may be used to refer to business conducted in schools, colleges and universities. Then again, it may be the institutions, or the industry itself. Readers seem proficient at making the adjustment even when, or perhaps because, the term carries potential for such wide variation.

When we move to the subject of *adult education*, or any specialization in education, saying just what we mean and meaning just what we say, should, perhaps, be a less challenging task. Whatever we mean by education, adult education may mean all teaching and learning not directed at children; it may mean adult learning activities not conducted in universities, colleges or professional schools. Adult education may refer to a specific classification of institutions for teaching and learning. Another time it may refer to public policies, or even a cultural climate.

Interestingly, many who address the topic of lifelong learning really mean adult education and perhaps little more. Retraining, upgrading, or further education for those who are past the typical school-leaving age in a society are, for the most part, adult education programs. Irrespective of whether these programs are offered in a community hall, a renovated high school, a mosque or a Toyota factory, it is education for adults, and most often nothing more. Lifelong adult education, or education for adults through the lifespan, merely signifies multiple experiences.

The distinction between education and learning is meaningful in this context. The former may be broadly or narrowly interpreted as a process or as a set of institutions, while the latter is more a product than a process. However, the production of the product is ongoing, and for this reason learning is often confused with process. The very nature of learning and its relationship to life implies that we learn as we live. Lifelong education is a lifespan process, most often associated with institutions. Learning, and lifelong learning especially, are much broader product-oriented concepts. They encompass stock that comes from living or life itself. In this regard, formal education, non-formal education, social and recreational activities and just plain living all play a process role leading to the product of lifelong learning. In effect, lifelong education is the business, and lifelong learning is the product, we expect, of what goes on in that business. To stop learning is to stop living. Ch'i Pai-shih's seal (see Lai, 1973, p. 172), *I shall learn as long as I breathe*, is tautological. It is also a secular metaphysical statement. It expresses an attitude toward life that is in accord with the learning imperatives of an economy that serves the end of more and better consumption.

Lifelong learning has become prominent because factors associated with the development of the information society, including increased competition in the manufacturing and service sectors of our economies and more aggressive and freer trade, have created a need for learning (the products) to be inculcated within all societies more often and more aggressively. More people need to learn more at a higher level in order for economies to grow and remain competitive in the next century (see *Education and the Wealth of Nations*, 1997). Strongly embedded is the notion that more learning of different and various types throughout the lifespan will lead to a better and stronger society overall.

All of this has led to discussions of a "learning society", a paradigm where more active learning of a higher order, much of it related though not exclusively to vocational skill training, will be broadly embraced as a learning ethic throughout the world. This is the notional essence of lifelong learning. Worth emphasising is the fact that although the new learning paradigm has a vocational emphasis when discussed in most papers, it is meant to be far more inclusive. Living becomes an open metaphor for learning.

But what makes these notions different today, when in point of fact education and learning customarily have been portrayed as cure-alls for societal ills? First, there are the drivers of freer trade, higher technology and increased competition. Second, there are opportunities on the near horizon, available through newer communications technologies, that will allow far greater access to educational providers without regard to distance or time, and with a very different cost structure. In short, the need or perceived need for increased educational opportunities, and the resultant learning, is creating unprecedented demand, and supply is likely to be more broadly available with delivery strongly influenced by technology. Thus we move towards a learning society.

TIEBOUT'S THEORY AND THE LEARNING SOCIETY

Education has been typecast as an example of a public good (see Musgrave, 1939; Samuelson, 1954; Tiebout, 1956). Public goods are those where collective consumption takes place, and the enjoyment or consumption by one person does not reduce the enjoyment or consumption by another. Defense and public broadcasting are two common examples. It has been argued that, with public goods, market-type systems fail to deliver the appropriate amount. Voters will be unwilling to reveal their true consumption preferences, and, by understating these, will hope to enjoy the benefits while evading the price.

Charles Tiebout (1956) in his *Pure Theory of Local Expenditures* argued that even if the market does fail with regard to public goods delivered at the central government level, and this remains an opinion under debate, such a failure does not necessarily occur at the local level, at least under certain conditions. Tiebout acknowledged Samuelson's conceptualization of the citizen/taxpayer as consumer. He then gave us a model of local governments as competitive suppliers of goods and services and as tax collectors. Citizens, or consumers/taxpayers, exert pressure on local governments and politicians in part by moving out or moving into jurisdictions. (For this we credit him with the notion of taxpayers "voting with their feet".)

A better way to express epithetically and concisely the serious thinking of Tiebout about ends and means might be: to some extent, politicians and governments must do what their neighbours do, when what their neighbours' politicians and governments do is smarter, more efficient, and more agreeable to their constituents.

Unlike national defense and public radio, education does not necessarily require central government intervention. Indeed, Tiebout points out that there are many public goods which are not delivered by a central government. Fire protection, police services and medical care, as well as education, are not typically associated with a centralized government structure, except perhaps in the smallest of economies where there is little size differential between central and local governments. In fact, within local governments the total dollar value of expenditures is often larger than central government expenditures, particularly if defense is excluded. Also interesting is the fact that local governments vary considerably in terms of the consumption opportunities they provide. For many local governments, education is one of if not the largest single categories of expenditures.

Tiebout's model makes several assumptions, the most important for the purpose of this discussion include: (a) full consumer mobility with no employment-based restrictions; (b) full consumer knowledge of different goods and services available in different communities; and (c) a very large number of communities from which the consumer is free to select. At the time in which Tiebout wrote, the necessity for these assumptions is what made the model a *pure theory*. However, these assumptions, in the face of changes that may be taking place faster than the effects can be reasonably assimilated, may be outdated, and the focal application to education and lifelong learning may only now be appreciated.

When workers must walk to work because they lack basic transportation, the number of choices (freedom) they experience in their lives is limited. When workers get bicycles, choice (freedom) expands dramatically. With the establishment of a basic public transport system, choice (freedom) increases again and even more dramatically. For some, the arrival of personal access to automobiles signals the definitive freedom. However, in all these contexts, a basic structural element remains intact: the worker/consumer must go to the job, the goods, and the services. In the educational context, the consumer goes to the school, to the college or to the university. Learning remains linked to a limited number of fixed-place educational institutions, and while today's consumer experiences some freedom, there is much more to be had.

It is the development of an information society that will result in much greater consumer freedom, a degree of freedom that will seriously challenge central governments, in many ways, for reasons illustrated by Tiebout's theory. Tiebout pointed out, perhaps indirectly, that central governments play a lesser role in the provision of goods and services than might be widely appreciated, and that this is good. The needs of consumers vary, they are not cut from the same cloth, and indeed the variation is extreme. From this comes the notion that the more goods and services provided by the central government, the fewer the choices, and therefore there is less freedom available to the consumer. The more access the consumer has to different bundles of goods and services offered by local governments, the more choices, and

hence freedom, enjoyed by the consumer.

The information society, one where electronic communication on an unprecedented scale will provide global access to information and services, is at the doorstep. National barriers, including trade tariffs, which have inhibited freedom in the past, will fall. Some barriers will fall slower than others, but they will fall, everywhere, and sooner rather than later. Regardless, in this decade central governments have continued in various ways to control electronic communications, and some are developing grand schemes to build new barriers in an attempt to prevent the consumer from becoming freer. But the fact remains, as the information society emerges consumers will increasingly experience Tiebout's key assumptions as realities, and education and learning, process and product, will be at the heart of much of this.

Consumer mobility, Tiebout's first assumption, will soon be defined very differently. What matters is not so much the physical ability of the consumer to move, but rather the ability of the consumer to reach out electronically for the purpose of consumption, public and otherwise. Increasingly consumers are doing so without regard to national boundaries. The second assumption, full consumer knowledge, is aided and abetted through the same means. Not only is the consumer increasingly aware of options, but the ability to sift through choices and opportunities is being nourished through electronic channels. The third assumption, having a large number of communities from which the consumer is free to select, is addressed through electronic means and the increasing inability of governments to direct consumer mobility. Access to a world of communities and commodities, including education, is at the doorstep.

The role of central governments is being challenged quite broadly as consumers question, often in a micro sense, what value they deliver. Witness the recent order emerging in Asia and Europe as the strong centrally directed Union of Soviet Socialist Republics disappeared almost overnight. Who can argue that there will *always* be a United Kingdom? Or a united Canada or a united U.S.A.? Though discussions of this sort are quite sensitive, it should be said, and said without equivocation, that evidence suggests an evolutionary tendency towards greater power and autonomy vested within smaller communities which deliver discrete packages of benefits to their members. Directly or indirectly, the question is being asked with more frequency, "what do central governments provide, and at what cost?" Where central governments cost more (usually in the form of taxes) and deliver or are perceived to deliver less, their value will be challenged, and increasingly so as consumers have access to other suppliers. The question of what value large, central governments bring to education generally, and lifelong learning in particular, and at what cost is a natural outcome of the broader discussion.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS

Local governments in most economies are most directly responsible for delivering, though not necessarily structuring, education. However, there are two key issues to examine, the first being the potential for competition *between* local governments including their institutions, and the second being the potential for increasing com-

petition between local governments and the private sector, particularly in light of borderless economies. This section of the paper examines the first of these.

When a consumer elects to live in one community, rather than another community, some degree of competition is involved. Communities need to offer not only an attractive grouping of goods and services, but must do so in an efficient manner. Assuming reasonable mobility, consumers will elect to live and pay taxes in the community which delivers the preferred goods and services at the lowest cost. Accordingly, there will be efficiencies related to community size, and communities will attempt to attract or deflect new residents in an effort to reach the optimal size.

Local governments and the communities they represent act much like corporations, and indeed some are. The primary goal of a corporation is to survive, while the secondary goal is to grow and increase autonomy. In this context, autonomy is the ability to act upon and influence different issues and enterprises, and is directly related to available resources including the size of the budget. Central governments are most powerful within their jurisdictions because they make laws. However, outside their jurisdictions they are competitors with other governments. Some are more powerful than others, just as some local governments are more powerful than others, but a central government on the regional or world stage is rarely sovereign; it must compete. Local governments compete in a similar manner, but the premise developed here is that they are about to do so in greater numbers and in more ways than ever before.

Competition between local governments is keen and well illustrated within and between Canada and the United States. Suburban tax districts compete with core areas in large cities. Each offers different choices in lifestyle and different tax burdens. Each carves out a niche, presenting the best of what it has to offer. Rural communities in particular actively intervene in the market process to recruit from certain occupational groups, doctors being an obvious case, in order to provide the grouping of goods and services that makes for a desirable community. Small and rural communities also have difficulty maintaining a post-secondary educational infrastructure. Post-secondary educational opportunities, in a large or small community, attract potential residents, particularly those with children. By comparison, older residents have less interest in paying for a fully developed educational infrastructure.

Local governments may purchase services rather than developing infrastructure. The fact is, local governments are increasingly subject to the reality that consumers have increased mobility. If a community is not providing goods and services which are preferred, and at a competitive price, people will move. Competition is increasingly keen. In this respect it is interesting to note recent cross-border recruiting between the United States and Canada. Toronto area nursing schools in particular have become targets for U.S. recruiters. Local governments in parts of Arizona, California and Florida actively recruit nurses, clearly determined to purchase the product rather than develop the educational infrastructure. Why? Tiebout would have us conclude that this approach is more cost effective and that the purchase of services, rather than the development of that component of an educational infrastructure, is part of the unique bundle of goods and services offered by these com-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

munities. In the case of retirement communities in the southern U.S., it makes sense for them to buy graduates rather than build schools.

The notion of purchasing already-trained professionals is in some ways no different than purchasing any other commodity such as electricity, water and waste disposal service from a neighbouring jurisdiction. There is one way, however, in which it can be quite different. Local governments in Arizona are not paying Toronto for nurses, a commodity which has cost Toronto and Ontario taxpayers dearly. During their training, the nurses were heavily subsidized both by the city and province. Now they are moving to another jurisdiction before any benefits accrue to the public that subsidized the training. Actual costs and benefits are not easily quantifiable, but in a broad context it is clear that local governments in Arizona are paying a price well below cost for this resource.

Students from one jurisdiction (taxation area) receiving benefits in another has sometimes been addressed through differential tuition fees. The student who studies in New York, but who resides or has resided in Florida, pays out-of-state tuition fees. Similarly, the student who lives in British Columbia and who wishes to study in Arizona will pay a premium. The rationale for this is twofold. First, it is assumed that neither the student nor the student's parents have paid taxes to support the development of the educational infrastructure, and it is also probable that on graduation the student will return home or move elsewhere. In the past, this scheme worked reasonably well, and in those jurisdictions where tuition differentials didn't reflect actual costs it may be that other benefits accrued. In the information society, all of this will be questioned for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that students may not find it necessary to travel to Toronto, or any other city, in order to make use of the educational resources hosted by that city.

But what of the locally-funded public institutions themselves? These are, or may be considered, extensions of local governments. They are subsidized in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, by regional or local governments rather than central government. Schools, colleges and universities are included in this grouping, and the issues at hand relate directly to lifelong learning.

Locally-funded public institutions have been sheltered from the open market system to varying degrees by geography, trade barriers, public subsidies and, in some cases, monopoly or near-monopoly privileges. Schools, colleges and universities have for the most part played to a home-grown market. Quite recently, local institutions, particularly those which are in the education business, have begun to realize that the consumer is about to be faced with many more opportunities and choices than ever before. Interactive multimedia programming will bring the best educational opportunities from around the world to the consumer's doorstep. How will local schools, particularly those at the post-secondary level, respond?

Many colleges and universities are attempting to acquire a foothold in what is thought to be a quickly evolving and open market for higher education where distance will lose its meaning. At this stage, these institutions are for the most part designing courses and programs for electronic delivery, typically via the internet and world wide web. Arguments which support the early development of electronic course offerings, even before the environment is fully understood or the technology

completely developed, are based on territorial imperatives and market axioms. Generally, colleges and universities see the potential for other institutions to poach students, and the development of electronically delivered programs is in most cases a defensive rather than an offensive competitive manoeuvre. The market axiom is that it is much easier to hold or protect market share than steal market share. Hence, the belief is that the first institutions into the market will have an edge.

That having been said, it is difficult to appreciate just how challenging the competitive environment is going to be for publicly-funded educational institutions. To begin with, in an electronically-based information society, students will be able to access a wide range of institutions. Why study at a local college if it becomes possible to enrol at Stanford, the University of Hong Kong, or the National University of Singapore? This is not to suggest that all or even many first-tier institutions will open enrolment since most of the prestige that accrues to the top institutions comes from their ability to exclude. Regardless, all it will take is for a few of the foremost institutions to open enrolment in order to generate a very different competitive environment for local institutions.

In this climate, smaller local institutions may be best advised to focus on the unique strengths they bring to the community and community education, rather than try to compete in the electronic environment with larger well-known institutions. Observation, however, suggests that hard environmental analysis is not widely adopted by smaller local institutions. For the most part these institutions have little experience in a competitive market, and minimal knowledge of marginal costs and market influences. Currently, some are underpricing products and services in order to buy market share with a view to convincing the local community of their institutional importance through large enrolments regardless of where students come from. These institutions may feel that if they lose local students to other institutions, the community will question the necessity for any local support. In the United States, where public community colleges are supported by local tax dollars and governed by locally selected or elected boards, the challenges will be the greatest.

Returning to Tiebout's model, it is clear that market pressures will be exerted on local governments and hence on locally-funded public institutions. Questions will be asked as to why communities should support local schools if higher education in particular can be delivered more effectively and efficiently from elsewhere. Similarly, it will be asked why local taxpayers are supporting local colleges if a significant portion of the benefit is being consumed by others. The national and regional imperatives of "buying locally" will be set aside, if in fact they ever truly existed. In this environment, smaller, second- and third-tier colleges are in danger of becoming anachronisms, particularly if they attempt to challenge first-tier institutions in the international marketplace.

PRIVATE SECTOR COMPETITION

As regulatory walls fall, trade and competition becomes freer, and consumer mobility increases, local governments will be pressured to behave more like rational consumers rather than monopoly producers. They will seek to purchase goods and

services on behalf of taxpayers from a wider variety of suppliers, and under Tiebout's model this will lead to dramatically increased options for consumers. For a time, some local governments will be able to act like and compete with private producers, supplying goods and services in which they have a competitive position to other governments and directly to consumers in order to boost revenues and affect the tax base. However, the degree to which local governments will be able to effectively compete in the longer term is likely to be limited. In time, governments at all levels will do less, more effectively. The private sector will do more, more efficiently.

The private sector, then, will crowd the marketplace on a broader, regional and perhaps even global scale pushing government-provided goods and services aside. Consumers generally will question why taxes are paid to any government for collective consumption when those same services can be purchased more inexpensively in the quantity and of the quality demanded by individual consumers. In effect, consumers will question why they would consume precisely what their neighbours consume when they are able to buy directly and get exactly what they prefer, or not buy at all. Generally, the freer and electronically enhanced marketplace will be a far more personalized consumption environment for consumers.

Education broadly, and post-secondary education particularly, is one of the services collectively consumed by taxpayers which will be dramatically altered by market forces including communications technologies and freer trade. Currently, there is an interesting variety within different economies in so far as public and private consumption of post-secondary education is concerned. In East Asia, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia for example, the most prestigious post-secondary institutions are publicly supported colleges and universities. In the United States, the reverse is true. There, the most prestigious colleges and universities are private. In Canada, there are relatively few private institutions. Though most universities and some colleges in Canada hold their own charters, they are almost entirely publicly-funded. The degree of government support along with government legislation has dissuaded private sector competition. The private versus public mix, as well as different status levels, will affect the ways in which these institutions adapt to the more competitive environment.

In the current environment, external providers of services, including education, have been restricted from entry by geography and, in some cases, by law. However, in the case of education, which is a knowledge-based product, governments, central and local, will have great difficulty preventing the entry of local, regional, national and even international providers as the information society takes hold. Earlier in this paper mention was made of education being a public good, one where consumer preferences are difficult to determine and, hence, where there is rationale for government intervention. The environment of the next decade will likely provide ample evidence to contradict this belief.

Education is a superior good. As such, when disposable income increases, peoples' expenditures on education, particularly for their children, increase at a disproportionately faster rate. Education is a commodity that can be provided through a market system, and this is the way in which higher education is currently delivered

throughout much of the world, Canada being an exception. Consumers will pay for access to education and training in the private sector, even when it may be available in part through publicly-financed programming, particularly when the demand exceeds the supply available from publicly-supported institutions. Similarly, the private sector demonstrates much greater propensity to fund on-the-job and off-the-job training when the public sector is not providing it. Arguments that the market fails when private firms engage in worker training have been contradicted (see *Schools brief: Investing in people*, pp. 85-86).

The sum of this discussion posits that private sector delivery of education in particular will increase dramatically as technology evolves, trade becomes freer, and the learning society develops. Consumers who want to learn will find ways of doing so, both internal and external to the traditional educational establishment. Students will increasingly cross national boundaries both to avoid particular systems as well as to attend specific opportunities. As the demand for learning opportunities increases dramatically within the context of the learning society, no government and no set of publicly sponsored institutions will be able to adequately respond. Consumers will, in the end, demand greater choice and the right to make their own consumption decisions, and governments will be right when they decide to put these decisions in the hands of consumers.

TIEBOUT'S THEORY AND LIFELONG LEARNING

Tiebout's theory, about which much has been written (see for example, Ellickson, 1970; Hamilton, 1975; Bucovetsky, 1982; Yinger, 1982), has been hotly debated within its conceptual framework. In these pages, it has been argued that in a global economy Tiebout's theory will become increasingly practical under the influences of freer trade, technological evolution, and the arrival of the learning society. Central governments and, more importantly, local governments will be less inclined to produce and deliver goods and services and more inclined to either purchase on behalf of consumers or, better still, leave the consumption decision entirely in the hands of consumers. Governments and the private sector will be increasingly swayed by more mobile consumers who can reach out electronically in order to broaden consumption decisions.

In many economies collective consumption at the local government level far exceeds that which takes place at the central government level. In addition, costs associated with education are often the single largest consumption element at the local government level. Under Tiebout's model, local governments provide a variety of consumption options related to education. Full consumer mobility, extensive consumer knowledge and a large number of communities make the model consumer reactive. To date, these variables and the model have been pure or conceptual only. However, the development of a lifelong learning ethic will create demand, which when coupled with technology and freer trade, will result in the private sector playing a greatly increased role in the delivery of education to meet the quantitative and qualitative demand for lifelong learning. The effect will be to reduce the role of local governments in one of the largest consumption decisions, and hence the degree to which each can distinguish itself. This will further increase pressure

for local governments to compete with each other and move Tiebout's model closer to reality.

The future of publicly-funded educational institutions, particularly those with a focus on higher education, in an era characterised by an entrenched lifelong learning ethic, is interesting to consider. First, there will be more institutions, many of them private, and a variety of programming of all types and all levels will be demanded and made available. This will not only result in increased competition and have taxpayers questioning why the public sector shouldn't be less involved, or not at all, but it will also query the broader role of continuing and higher education. Currently, much of what higher education does is to exclude. Through exclusion institutions limit entry into occupations and social status, and are mostly graded on this ability to exclude. The most exclusive institutions of them, and those that want to be exclusive, may not join the lifelong learning path. Instead, some may continue to be what they are, schools for the few rather than schools for the many. Continuing in this track, they run the risk that in a lifelong learning environment more students will discover earlier that, "Four years was enough of Harvard. I still had a lot to learn, but had been given the liberating notion that now I could teach myself" (John Updike, quoted in Simpson, 1988, p. 121). Community colleges and other publicly-funded "access" institutions have been described as inclusive, but in reality are simply less exclusive. In a freer environment they will face vigorous and dynamic challenges. Will they carve out new niches? Can they become entrepreneurial? Will they manage to be inclusive and competitive?

The Scottish statesman Henry Brougham said that, "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave" (Vitullo-Martin & Moskin, 1994, p. 99). Perhaps he was confusing education with learning? Ultimately, in a society characterised by lifelong learning, knowledgeable and mobile consumers will shake and shape educational institutions, and those which have been sheltered from the marketplace will be challenged as never before.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bucovetsky, S. (1982, February). Inequality in the local public sector. *Journal of Political Economy, 90*, 128-145.

Education and the wealth of nations. (1997, March 29). *The Economist, 342*(8010), 15-16.

Ellickson, B. (1970). *Metropolitan residential location and the public sector.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston.

Hamilton, B. (1975, June). Zoning and property taxation in a system of local governments. *Urban Studies, 12*, 205-211.

Lai, T. C. (1973). *Ch'i Pai Shih*. Hong Kong: Swindon.

Musgrave, R. (1939, February). The voluntary exchange theory of public economy. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, LII*, 213-217.

Samuelson, P. (1954, November). The pure theory of public expenditures. *Review of Economics and Statistics, XXXVI*(4), 387-389.

Schools brief: Investing in people. (1994, March 26th). *The Economist, 330*(7856), 85-86.

Simpson, J. (1988). *Simpson's contemporary quotations*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Tiebout, C. M. (1956, October). A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy, 64*, 416-424.

Vitullo-Martin, J. & Moskin, J. (1994). *Executive's book of quotations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yinger, J. (1982, October). Capitalization and the theory of local public finance. *Journal of Political Economy, 90*, 917-943.